

WHERE DOES *ʔayyē* COME FROM?

PROCLISIS AND AFFIX PLEONASM IN THE BIBLICAL HEBREW INTERROGATIVES *ʔē* AND *ʔayyē**

BENJAMIN KANTOR

THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Abstract

Interrogatives from the base **ʔayy-* are common throughout Semitic. Two of the reflexes of this base in Biblical Hebrew, *ʔē* ‘where?’ and *ʔayyē* ‘where?’, exhibit atypical phonological features. In the case of *ʔē* (< **ʔayy-v*), the diphthong **ay* ought to have been preserved due to the following gemination (cf. *day* [< **dayy-v*] ‘sufficiency’). In the case of *ʔayyē*, the final *šere* is unusual. In this paper, I argue that contraction has occurred in *ʔē* because it is proclitic and that the *šere* (*-ē*) ending in *ʔayyē* is from the Semitic adverbial ending **-ay*, which also contracted to *-ē* due to proclisis. The morphosyntactic developments of these forms, taken within their wider Semitic context, shed light on the linguistic phenomenon of “affix pleonasm” in both Hebrew and Semitic.

The Problem

The particle **ʔayy-ν* for the interrogative ‘where?’ is common in Semitic. In Biblical Hebrew (BH), however, we find two primary reflexes of this interrogative particle, *ʔē* and *ʔayyē*, each of which exhibits a peculiar feature. First, **ʔayy-ν* has reduced in the word *ʔē*, even though monosyllabic words of the pattern **Cayy-ν* should not reduce in Hebrew to *Cē*. Second, the unusual *šere* ending in the word *ʔayyē* still lacks a comprehensive explanation.

After a brief review of scholarship, I will argue (1) that the reason for the reduction of **Cayy-ν* > *Cē* in the word *ʔē* is because it is proclitic and (2) that the ending of the word *ʔayyē* is actually the Semitic adverbial ending **-ay* which is reduced to *-ē* because the word *ʔayyē*, just like its counterpart, is also proclitic. I will conclude by suggesting that the development of these forms and their morphosyntactic features should be seen in light of the linguistic phenomenon known as “affix pleonasm.”

Previous Suggestions

Few scholars deal with the diachrony of the BH forms *ʔē* and *ʔayyē* at length.

Nevertheless, due to their similar shape and phonological behavior, the interrogative *ʔayyē* has often been compared to the deictic particle *hinnē* ‘look!’. Joüon and Muraoka,

for example, explain the form *hinnē* (cf. *hēn*) as a back-formation from the form *hinnēni* (with 1cs suffix) and suggest that the *šere* ending in *ʔayyē* may be similarly explained.¹

Tropper argues that **ʔayyā^h* (< **ʔayya*), rather than *ʔayyē*, would be the expected form of this interrogative particle and that **ʔayyā^h* would be a form with a secondarily lengthened accusative case ending. The reason the form **ʔayyā^h*—and more central to Tropper's article, **hinnā^h*—is not attested is because three separate forms were conflated (in vocalization) into one single form in the particle *hinnē^h*: **hinnā^h* (without suffix), **hinnēhû* (with 3ms suffix), and **hinnāh* (with 3fs suffix). Presumably, then, *ʔayyē* reflects the conflation of **ʔayyā^h* (without suffix), **ʔayyēhû* (with 3ms suffix), and **ʔayyāh* (with 3fs suffix). Tropper suggests that the catalyst for this conflation was a meta-analysis of the form based on the similarity between the *–ē* ending and the 3ms suffix in Aramaic *–ēh*: **hinn* + *ē* ‘here he/it is!’ > **hinnē* ‘here!/look!’; **ʔayy* + *ē* ‘where is he/it?’ > **ʔayyē* ‘where?’.²

Schorch, dealing with the words *ʔašrē* ‘blessedness of’ and *hinnē*, objects to Tropper’s reconstruction, pointing out that his reconstruction would lead to the form ***hinnāhû*, that the development of **-ēhû* > **-ēh* is without parallels elsewhere in the

Tiberian tradition, and that a final consonantal *heh* (*h*) should be marked with a *Mappiq* in the Hebrew text. Alternatively, Schorch posits that the form *hinnē* is the result of the enclitic particle **-y* [**-ya*], which is attested in Ugaritic as a direct speech marker and a component of other adverbs, being attached to the base form **hinna*: **hinna* + **-y(a)* > **hinnay* > *hinnē*. It is not clear if he would suggest a similar development for *ʔayyē*.³

Sjörs reconstructs the form *ʔayyē* from **ʔayy-ay*, interpreting **ʔay(y)-* as an interrogative base and noting that in Central Semitic **ʔayy-* often functions as an interrogative or indefinite determiner ‘which?’. He argues that the locative suffix **-ay* is attached to the interrogative base **ʔay-* to form the Hebrew interrogative *ʔayyē*. In the case of Hebrew *ʔē*, he argues that a different locative suffix, namely **-ū*, is attached to the base **ʔay(y)-* but then elided/contracted.⁴

While I readily admit that the explanations of both Tropper and Schorch are possible, there are several problematic issues worth considering. First, in the case of Tropper, we must accept that at some point the “correct” vocalization of consonantal *hnh* (or *ʔyh*) was lost and then the word was consequently revocalized according to another form. While such a phenomenon is by no means uncommon—note, for

example, the discrepancy between the consonantal text and the vocalization for the 2ms suffix (consonantal: *-k* vs. vocalization: **-kā*)—an explanation consistent with the Masoretic vocalization is to be preferred when reasonable. Second, the base form **hinna* is posited on the basis of the behavior of possessive suffixes. However, the form of suffixes on a particular particle can be and often is the result of analogy with other forms. Third, it is not entirely clear to what degree the developments pertaining to *hinnē* may parallel those of *ʔayyē*. For example, while Schorch’s argument may be plausible in the case of *hinnē*, there is no clear path of morphosyntactic development for how a *productive* “direct speech marker” **-y(a)* in Ugaritic can explain a form that seems to be inherited in both Ugaritic and Hebrew.⁵

I generally agree with the reconstruction of Sjörs, but will further develop and elaborate on it from a diachronic perspective, giving particular attention to the development and morphosyntactic features of the forms *ʔē* and *ʔayyē* in BH.

A Brief Overview of the Interrogative Particle *ʔayy-* in Semitic

The interrogative particle **ʔayy-ν* with the meaning ‘where?’, or some form of it, is well-attested throughout Semitic. In Old Akkadian it appears in proper names such as

ʔAyyabum ‘where is the father?’. Standard Babylonian also bears witness to the same particle with contraction of the diphthong in the phrase *e tāšina qutrinna* ‘where can you smell incense?’.⁶ There are also other forms which have some sort of suffix attached as in *ayyānum kaspi* ‘where is there any silver of mine?’.⁷ Amarna Canaanite as well yields forms like *ayyāmi*, *ayyāti*, and *ayyakam* all meaning ‘where?’.⁸ It is found in Geʿez in a number of variations off the base *ʔayte* (< *ʔay + -te) ‘where?’.⁹ The form *ʔayna* meaning ‘where?’ is attested in Arabic.¹⁰ In Jewish Literary Aramaic we find the forms *ʔy mnn* ‘whence?’ as well as *ʔyk?* ‘where now?’.¹¹ Finally, the interrogative particle ‘where?’ is attested in Ugaritic as both *ʔiy* and *ʔi*, which may be vocalized as *ʔiyyv* and *ʔē*, respectively.¹² The former, despite the *i* vowel, is nevertheless derived from *ʔayyv*.¹³ The latter form, though identical with Hebrew *ʔē*, must be regarded as a separate development.¹⁴

Therefore, we may reasonably reconstruct this particle as *ʔayy- in its base form.¹⁵ How, then, do we explain the reflexes of this word in BH? First, we need to understand under what circumstances we can expect *ay > ē in Hebrew.

The Reflexes of the Diphthong *ay in Biblical Hebrew

The Proto-Northwest Semitic (PNWS) diphthong **ay* has essentially three realizations in BH. First, it is preserved when it is stressed and not before a final consonant.¹⁶ This may be illustrated in words such as *laylā* ‘night’ and *habbaytā* ‘to the house’. If, however, the stressed diphthong is before a final consonant, it is triphthongized (**ay* > *áyī* / $_{[-str]} C\#$) as in the word **bayt* > *bayīt* ‘house’. Finally, if it is unstressed, it is reduced to *-ē* (**ay* > *-ē* / $_{[-str]}$) as in the construct form of the same word, *bēṭ-* ‘the house of’, and with the masculine plural construct ending, as in *sūsē-* ‘the horses of’.¹⁷

The Form of *ʔē*

When we come to the form *ʔē*, however, we must keep in mind the fact that while final short vowels were lost (*-ǃ* > \emptyset / $_{\#}$) prior to the collapse of unstressed diphthongs, final gemination was only simplified (C_2C_2 > C_2 / $_{\#}$) at a later stage.¹⁸ Therefore, even if the word **ʔayy-ǃ* were unstressed at the time of the collapse of unstressed diphthongs, the gemination in **ʔayy* would have caused the diphthong **ay* to have been preserved. That gemination prevented the reduction of the diphthong **ay* can be seen in the difference between the words *ḥēlēhem* (< **ḥaylayhimm*) ‘their wealth(s)’ and *ḥayyēhem* (< **ḥayyayhimm*) ‘their life’.¹⁹ Therefore, since gemination ought still to

have been present when $*ay > \bar{e} / _[-str]$ operated, the expected realization of this word in BH ought to be $*ʔay$ rather than $ʔ\bar{e}$.

This point is also supported by a number of monosyllabic nouns which do indeed exhibit this same pattern: $ḥay$ ($< *ḥayy-v$) ‘life/living’, day ($< *dayy-v$) ‘sufficiency’, $šay$ ($< *ṭayy-v$) ‘tribute’, and $ʔay$ ($< *ǧayy-v$) ‘Ai’. How, then, do we end up with the form $ʔ\bar{e}$ and not $*ʔay$ from $*ʔayy-v$? The answer can be found by comparing the construct forms of such words, in which the diphthong *does* reduce to \bar{e} ($*ḥay > ḥ\bar{e}$ - and $*day > d\bar{e}$ -).²⁰ What is it, then, that differentiates the construct forms that would explain such a change? In the case of monosyllabic nouns, construct forms are proclitic and thus unstressed. Therefore, proclisis (i.e. being unstressed) must have been the phonological trait that the word $*ʔay$ had in common with the construct forms $*ḥay$ and $*day$ for them to have undergone the same sound change ($*ay > -\bar{e} / _[-str]$) to $ʔ\bar{e}$ and $ḥ\bar{e}/d\bar{e}$, respectively.²¹

We have already established, however, that the collapse of unstressed diphthongs ($*ay > -\bar{e} / _[-str]$) that caused $*bayt$ - and $*sūsay$ - to change to $b\bar{e}ṭ$ - and $sūs\bar{e}$ - would not have impacted the words under discussion. This is because the final gemination in $*ʔayy$, $*dayy$, and $*ḥayy$ would not have been simplified until later, and

thus would have prevented the reduction of the diphthong at the time in which **bayt-* was reduced to **bēt-* (cstr.).²² Precisely because of this fact we must propose that the reduction of the diphthong **ay* not only in *ʔē*, but also in the words *dē-* (cstr.) and *hē-* (cstr.) occurred later than did the contraction of the diphthong in the words *bēt-* and *sūsē-*. Accordingly, it is an internal Hebrew development.

Therefore, we may conclude that an identical sound rule (**ay* > *-ē* / *_{[-str]}*) must have operated a second time also after the simplification of final gemination. This is not surprising, since the construct forms of the words under discussion are the *only* forms in BH which would have been effected by such a later change.²³ In sum, the two most salient points of this section are that *ʔē* must have come about as a result of it being proclitic (i.e., unstressed), and that a collapse of diphthong sound rule (**ay* > *-ē* / *_{[-str]}*) was in operation a second time in BH, after the simplification of final gemination.

The Syntax of *ʔē*

The distribution of the word *ʔē* also support this claim. Although the evidence is scant, it is consistent. The particle *ʔē*, by itself,²⁴ appears only three times in the biblical text—four if we accept the *qere* form of Prov. 31.4.²⁵ In all of these cases, however, it

precedes a noun. Further, it only and always precedes *noun phrases*. Moreover, even when *ze* is affixed to *ʔē* to create the more frequently attested *ʔē ze* ‘where?’, the syntax is essentially the same as *ʔē* in that it precedes noun phrases.²⁶ While nouns are not the only element that can function as a dependent in construct, they are by far the most common in BH. Therefore, not only the form, but also the syntax of the word *ʔē* supports the claim that it is proclitic.

The Form of *ʔayyē*

The word *ʔayyē*, on the other hand, is made up of two morphemes. First, we have the interrogative particle **ʔayy-* as discussed above. Second, we have the *šere* ending (*-ē*). According to the sound rules of BH, a *šere* (*-ē*) must be the result of a collapsed diphthong **-ay*, an accented **-í* vowel being lowered/lengthened, or a collapsed triphthong **-ayv*/**-iyv* like in the construct forms of the words *bōnē* (< **bāniyv*) ‘builder’ and *maḥ(ă)nē* (< **maḥnayv*) ‘camp’.²⁷ We may eliminate the possibility of the ending of *ʔayyē* coming from an accented **-í* vowel for two reasons. First, even if we reconstruct the form ***ʔayy-i*, it would be difficult to explain why the stress would fall on the ultima.²⁸ Second, final short vowels were lost early on in Hebrew, which would eliminate whatever final vowel may have been attached to **ʔayy-v*.²⁹ In fact, such a

reconstruction would be expected to result in the form **ʔay* when stressed, and *ʔē* when unstressed, which we have already shown was indeed the development of the more basic form (**ʔayy-ʌ > *ʔayy > *ʔay > ʔē_[-str]*). While theoretically we could reconstruct ***ʔayy-ayʌ* or ***ʔayy-iyʌ*, there is no separate *-ayʌ/-iyʌ* morpheme attested in Semitic to explain the ending.

Accordingly, we are left with no other option but to assume that the *ʔere* ending in *ʔayyē* comes from the diphthong **-ay* and thus the reconstructed form would be **ʔayy-ay*.³⁰ At this point, there would have been two possible developments. First, the diphthong might have been preserved under the stress as in words like *māṭay*. Second, if unstressed, it would have reduced to *-ē* as in the masculine plural construct *sūsē-* (< **sūsay-*) and the long prepositions like *ʕādē* (< **ʕaday*) and *ʕālē* (< **ʕalay*).

Subsequent to this change, the resulting *-ē* would have lowered to *-e* under the stress, but would have been preserved as *-ē* when unstressed.³¹ Therefore, just like the basic form *ʔē*, the word *ʔayyē* must also have been proclitic, so that the unstressed diphthong collapsed (**ʔayy-ay > ʔayyē*).³²

The Syntax of *ʔayyē*

Much like in the case of $\text{?}\bar{e}$, the distribution of $\text{?ayy}\bar{e}$ also supports this claim. It occurs 45 times in the biblical text—48 if we count the three instances of the anomalous form $\text{?ayy}\bar{e}$ found in Hosea. Just as the more basic form, it only precedes noun phrases.³³ It should be added, however, that on three occasions a particle intervenes between $\text{?ayy}\bar{e}$ and the noun phrase,³⁴ that once it is followed by a non-suffixed pronoun,³⁵ and that once it merely stands by itself.³⁶ Nevertheless, it may be said that its syntax is essentially the same as its counterpart, $\text{?}\bar{e}$.

Summary of the Forms and Syntax of $\text{?}\bar{e}$ and $\text{?ayy}\bar{e}$

Based on the evidence we may reconstruct the form $\text{*?ayy-}\nu$ for the BH word $\text{?}\bar{e}$ and the form *?ayy-ay for the BH word $\text{?ayy}\bar{e}$. In the case of the former, any final vowel would have been lost and the resulting final gemination would have been simplified.

Subsequently, inasmuch as the form was proclitic and thus unstressed, the diphthong collapsed. In the case of the latter, the only sound change, i.e., the collapse of the final diphthong, may also be explained on the basis of it being proclitic and unstressed. This proclisis may have been a consequence of the forms becoming grammaticalized. The syntax of both of these words, namely the fact that they appear almost exclusively before noun phrases, seems to support this proposal.

Pronominal Suffixes

One last important point to be made is regarding pronominal suffixes. In addition to the three or four times in which the word *ʔē* appears by itself, it also appears eight to nine times with a pronominal suffix attached (*ʔayyekkā* ‘where are you?’, *ʔayyō* ‘where is he?’, *ʔayyām* ‘where are they?’).³⁷ It is noteworthy, however, that a pronominal suffix never appears attached to the longer form *ʔayyē*, but is always attached to the short form. This fact further supports the claim that *ʔē* (< **ʔayy-*) is the base form and that the longer form *ʔayyē* (< **ʔayy-ay*) has been augmented by some sort of suffix.

The Adverbial Ending *-ay in Semitic

At this point, we are still left with an incomplete explanation. Where do we get the ending *-ay which we have reconstructed for the end of the word *ʔayyē*? While the degree to which it is productive is debatable, there does seem to be an adverbial *-ay ending in Semitic.

Our earliest attestations of this *-ay ending come from Akkadian. In Babylonian we find words like *mati* ‘when?’, *ali* ‘where?’, *kī* ‘how?’, and *timāli* ‘yesterday’.³⁸ Interestingly, in Old Assyrian we also find the writing *a-le-e* for *alē* ‘where?’.³⁹ This same ending is also attested as -e in Neo-Assyrian as in *ammate* ‘until when?’.⁴⁰ Among

other examples von Soden lists as possibly reflecting the adverbial ending **-ay* are *bāsi* ‘soon’, *itti* ‘with’, *qadi* ‘together with’, *maḥri* ‘before’, *warki* ‘after’, *birti* (*berte* in Middle and Neo-Assyrian)⁴¹ ‘between’, *pāni* ‘earlier’, and *šalšūmi* (*šaššūme* in Neo-Assyrian)⁴² ‘the day before yesterday’. Accordingly, von Soden appropriately reconstructs this adverbial ending as **-ay* having undergone the **-ay > ī* (*ī > i / _#*) change in Babylonian, and **-ay > ē* change in Assyrian.⁴³

While the adverbial ending **-ay* does not seem to be nearly as productive in the rest of the Semitic languages, there are a number of vestiges. First, the word *matay* is attested in Old South Arabian written as *mṭy*,⁴⁴ in Arabic as *matā* (< **matay*), in Jewish Literary Aramaic as *ʔ(y)mṭy*,⁴⁵ and of course in BH as *māṭay*.⁴⁶ Additionally, it may be that the Arabic word *kay* (< **ka-* + *-ay*) is related to this adverbial ending.⁴⁷ Further, in Babylonian Talmudic Aramaic, alongside the variations of the word ‘yesterday’, *ʔytml* and *ʔtmwl*, is a spelling with a final *yod*, *ʔytmly*.⁴⁸ It may be that this reflects the same original **-ay* ending as does Akkadian *timāli*. Last, in Hebrew itself we have a rare variant of the word *ʔāz* ‘then’ written with a final *yod*, *ʔāzay*.⁴⁹

The Function of this Adverbial Ending

If this is indeed the ending of *ʔayyē*, does that mean that it has a different function than the form which lacks it, namely *ʔē*? Further, does the adverbial ending **-ay* have a distinct function in the wider Semitic context? Von Soden associates this ending in Akkadian with prepositions, adverbs of place and time, numerical adverbs, and adverbial expressions.⁵⁰ Sjörs suggests that **-ay* is a locative suffix in Semitic.⁵¹

This would be consistent with its being attached to an interrogative locative adverb, but it would be difficult to claim that the function of *ʔayyē* is somehow different from that of *ʔē*. For example, the three clear instances in which *ʔē* is used each have a syntactic parallel text in which *ʔayyē* is used.⁵² First, *ʔē ʔēlōhēmō* ‘where is their god?’ may be compared with *ʔayyē ʔēlōhēm* ‘where is their god?’.⁵³ Also, the use of the basic form with a proper name in *ʔē hebel ʔāhikā* ‘where is Abel, your brother?’ may be compared with the same function for the longer form in *ʔayyē šārā ʔišteḳā* ‘where is Sarah, your wife?’.⁵⁴ Last, its use with a noun in construct, *ʔē ḥānīt ham-melek* ‘where is the spear of the king?’ may be answered by the phrase *ʔayyē ḥāmaṭ ham-mēšiq* ‘where is the wrath of the oppressor?’.⁵⁵ Therefore, it seems unfruitful to try to find some sort of functional distinction between *ʔē* and *ʔayyē*.

Affix Pleonasm: Doubly-Marked Adverb

Rather, it seems that $\text{?}\bar{e}$ and $\text{?ayy}\bar{e}$ do indeed carry the same meaning and thereby constitute an example of “affix pleonasm” (also referred to as “over-characterization”).

Michael Covington argues that we may refer to something as “affix pleonasm” when “an affix that normally serves to add a particular unit of meaning gets attached to a root whose meaning already includes that unit.”⁵⁶ In other words, it is the addition of a semantically unnecessary suffix.⁵⁷ Such pleonastic marking may be regarded as implicit (i.e., lexical) or explicit (doubly-marked morphologically).⁵⁸ With $\text{?}\bar{e}$ and $\text{?ayy}\bar{e}$ we have a case of implicit pleonastic marking. In other words, the shorter form $\text{?}\bar{e}$, by itself, is already an interrogative locative adverb. However, the longer form $\text{?ayy}\bar{e}$ includes the addition of an adverbial suffix which, at least as one of its typical functions, marks adverbs of location. Therefore, the adverbial ending on $\text{?ayy}\bar{e}$ is a morphological marker of something already inherent in the lexical meaning of $\text{?}\bar{e}$. Accordingly, it is not surprising that these two distinct words fulfill the same function and share the same syntax in BH. In fact, it seems that the “over-characterized” form ($\text{?ayy}\bar{e}$) eventually surpassed the shorter form ($\text{?}\bar{e}$) as the more regularly used word.

This is not an isolated phenomenon in Hebrew, especially with short words. We may also compare it to the word for ‘whither?’ in BH. Even though the majority of the

time it is *ʔānā* (39 times), on two occasions we find a shorter form *ʔān*. Synchronically, at least, it appears that the longer (and much more frequent) form carries the directional *heh* (-*h*) as a suffix.⁵⁹ If that is the case, we have an adverbial suffix, consistent with the original meaning of the interrogative pronoun (i.e., direction), attached to it. Nevertheless, it fulfills the same function with the same syntax. This seems to be an appropriate parallel for the words *ʔē* and *ʔayyē*.

It is also worth noting that even among (at least some of) the Medieval Hebrew grammarians, the variant Hebrew forms deriving from the base **ʔayy-v* were regarded as related. For example, in the tenth-century lexicon of BH, written in Arabic by the Karaite David ben Abraham al-Fāsī (*Kitāb Jāmiʿ al-ʿAlfāẓ*), the following words are all listed under the entry for *ʔē* (following the order of the lexicon): *ʔē* ‘where?’, *ʔē mizze* ‘whence?’, *ʔē lā-zō(ʔ)ʔ* ‘on what basis/why?’, *ʔayyē* ‘where?’, *ʔayyō* ‘where is he/it?’, *ʔayyām* ‘where are they?’, *ʔayyekkā* ‘where are you?’, *ʔēpō* ‘where?’, *ʔēkō* ‘where?’, *ʔān* ‘whither?’, *ʔānā* ‘whither?’, *mēʔayin* ‘whence?’, *ʔayn* ‘there is not’, and *ʔēn* ‘there is not’. Moreover, al-Fāsī seems to demonstrate an awareness of the etymological relationship between Hebrew *ʔē* ‘where?’ and Arabic *ʔayn* ‘where?’ when he states that “it is not possible to correctly interpret/translate [*ʔē mizze*] in Arabic except if you add *mem*

before *ʔē* and thus you say *min ʔayn ...* ” (*wa-lā yaṣiḥḥu tafsīruhu bi-al-ṣarabī ʔillā bi-taqdīm al-mem qabla ʔē fa-taqūlu min ʔayna ...*).⁶⁰

Affix Pleonasm as a Common Trend in Semitic

A similar phenomenon, i.e., the addition of suffixes to the base **ʔayy-*, may also be seen throughout Semitic.⁶¹ For example, while the shorter form *ay(ya)/e* is attested in Akkadian, we more frequently see various suffixes being attached to the word without significantly changing the meaning, such as *ayyānum*, *ayyāna*, and *ayyinna*.⁶² We find similar forms in Amarna Canaanite in the words *ayyāmi*, *ayyāti*, and *ayyakam* all meaning ‘where?’.⁶³ In Arabic, it may be that the ending *-na* has been suffixed to **ʔayy-* to produce *ʔayna*.⁶⁴ The form *ʔayte* (< **ʔay* + *-te*) is attested in Geʿez. In Jewish Literary Aramaic we do not find *ʔy* alone but in expressions such as *ʔy mnn* and *ʔykʔ*. In BH, in addition to the forms already discussed, we may also mention words and phrases such as *ʔē (miz)ze*, *ʔēpō*, and even *ʔēkā* as all having their origin in *ʔē* with the addition of some additional element.⁶⁵

Such a phenomenon is quite common cross-linguistically. According to Gardani, affix pleonasm may be found on nouns, adjectives, verbs, and adverbs. He references examples of affix pleonasm such as dialectal English *musician-er* (instead of *musician*),

Spanish *pie-s-es* ‘feet’ (with the plural marked twice), Latin *etern-alis* ‘eternal’ (with the adjective ending *-al* even though there exists the adjective *eternus*), Old Latin *da-n-unt* ‘they give’ (with the plural marked twice), and finally English *thusly* from the adverb *thus*.⁶⁶ The last example provides the closest parallel to *ʔē* and *ʔayyē* in that an adverbial marker (*-ly*) is affixed to what is already an adverb (*thus*). Also, it is worth noting that affix pleonasm is especially common when expressing spatial relationships.⁶⁷ Finally, cross-linguistically, interrogatives often have a tendency towards accruing additional endings.⁶⁸

Relative Chronology: Early Lexical Variants in Semitic

It seems that the best way to make sense of the data diachronically, at least for BH, is to regard *ʔayyē* as an inherited form rather than something that developed in BH or even in Proto-Canaanite for a number of reasons. For one, the adverbial ending **-ay* is no longer productive even in Akkadian. Further, when it shows up in West Semitic it is hardly more than a relic. Therefore, it is more likely that **ʔayy-ay* was actually a very early lexical variant of **ʔayy-ʔ* ‘where?’.

It seems to be the case that once (at a very early stage of Semitic) **ʔayy-ay* had developed from the simpler and more archaic form **ʔayy-ʔ*, the simpler form **ʔayy-ʔ*

did not fade out of use. Rather, both **ʔayy-ay* and **ʔayy-ʋ* seem to have existed side-by-side at this early stage. In fact, the evidence from the other Semitic languages seems to indicate that there were a number of lexical variants for the word ‘where?’ derived from the base **ʔayy-* with some sort of additional suffix, some existing side-by-side in the same language. Because such augmented forms are attested in both major branches of Semitic, it is likely that some of these lexical variants arose quite early. Therefore, it is reasonable to propose that Hebrew (and perhaps also Ugaritic) was the only language that preserved the *ʔayyē* (< **ʔayy-ay*) lexical variant, just as we also find unique lexical variants of **ʔayy-* + *suffix* preserved in other Semitic languages.

Relative Chronology: Summary of Sound Changes in Hebrew

Therefore, seeing as both words (*ʔē* and *ʔayyē*) were inherited from an earlier stage in Semitic, the sound changes in Hebrew can be summarized in the following chart:

	<i>Absolute</i>			<i>Construct</i>			<i>Proclitic</i>	
Proto-Northwest Semitic Form:	<i>*bayt-ʋ</i>	<i>*ḥayy-ʋ</i>	<i>*dayy-ʋ</i>	<i>*bayt-ʋ</i>	<i>*ḥayy-ʋ</i>	<i>*dayy-ʋ</i>	<i>*ʔayy-ʋ</i>	<i>*ʔayy-ay</i>
#1: Loss of final short vowels (ǃ > Ø _#)	<i>*bayt</i>	<i>*ḥayy</i>	<i>*dayy</i>	<i>*bayt</i>	<i>*ḥayy</i>	<i>*dayy</i>	<i>*ʔayy</i>	<i>*ʔayyay</i>

#2: Early collapse of unstressed diphthongs (<i>ay</i> > $\bar{e}_{-[-str]}$)	<i>*bayt</i>	<i>*ḥayy</i>	<i>*dayy</i>	<i>*bēt</i>	<i>*ḥayy</i>	<i>*dayy</i>	<i>*ʔayy</i>	<i>*ʔayyē</i>
#3: Simplification of final gemination ($C_2C_2 > C_2 / _ \#$)	<i>*bayt</i>	<i>*ḥay</i>	<i>*day</i>	<i>*bēt</i>	<i>*ḥay</i>	<i>*day</i>	<i>*ʔay</i>	<i>*ʔayyē</i>
#4: Late collapse of unstressed diphthongs (<i>ay</i> > $\bar{e}_{-[-str]}$)	<i>*bayt</i>	<i>*ḥay</i>	<i>*day</i>	<i>*bēt</i>	<i>*ḥē</i>	<i>*dē</i>	<i>*ʔē</i>	<i>*ʔayyē</i>
Masoretic Form:	<i>bayit</i>	<i>ḥay</i>	<i>day</i>	<i>bēt</i>	<i>ḥē</i>	<i>dē</i>	<i>ʔē</i>	<i>ʔayyē</i>

Absolute Chronology

While absolute dating is far more elusive than relative chronology, we may at least make some comments about the outer limits with respect to the dating of the various changes suggested above.

With respect to *ʔayyē*, we have already suggested that the form **ʔayy-ay* developed as an augmented form of **ʔayy-v* at a very early stage in Semitic. With respect to the collapse of the final diphthong **-ay* > \bar{e} in *ʔayyē*, it is likely that this change had already occurred before the composition of the earliest books of the

Hebrew Bible. This is because in the consonantal text of the Hebrew Bible this word is already spelled with a final *-h*, both in early and late books. Had the word been pronounced with a final consonantal *-y*, it would have been written with final *-y* instead of *-h*. The earliest explicit record of the vocalization of this word is found in the Greek transcriptions of Hebrew in the second column of Origen's (185–254 CE) Hexapla, where it is transcribed with a collapsed diphthong (**-ay > -ē*) as αἷη 'where?' (Ps. 89.50).⁶⁹ Nevertheless, the date for the collapse of the final diphthong in **ʔayy-ay* (**ʔayy-ay > ʔayyē*) is more likely to be between PNWS and the date of composition of the earliest books of the Hebrew Bible than at the time of the Greek transcriptions of Origen's Hexapla.

With respect to *ʔē*, the base form **ʔayy-ʷ* seems to go back as far as we can reconstruct Proto-Semitic. The loss of the final vowel (**ʔayy-ʷ > *ʔayy*) likely occurred at a very early stage of Hebrew. With respect to the simplification of final gemination (**ʔayy > *ʔay*) and the subsequent collapse of the diphthong (**ʔay > ʔē*), the evidence seems to point to a much later date for a number of reasons. First, in the consonantal text of the Hebrew Bible this word is always spelled with a final *-y*, which most likely indicates that the word was pronounced with a final consonantal *-y* (at least in the

earlier stages of Hebrew). Second, there is evidence as late as the Greek transcriptions of the second column of Origen's Hexapla that monosyllabic words with etymological final gemination exhibit different phonotactics than monosyllabic words without etymological final gemination: e.g., $\chi\omicron\lambda$ (< **kull*) 'all' (Ps. 35.28), cf. $\kappa\omega\lambda$ (< **qōl*) 'voice' (Ps. 28.6); $\lambda\epsilon\beta$ (< **libb*) 'heart' (Ps. 32.11), cf. $\eta\lambda$ (< **ʔil*) 'God'.⁷⁰ Third, even as late as the Greek transcriptions of Hebrew in the LXX translation of Genesis (3rd/2nd c. BCE), the diphthong **ay* was often preserved in unstressed syllables: e.g., Καινάν (< **qaynan*) 'Kenan' (Gen. 5.9); Αιλάμ (< **ʔaylam*) 'Elam' (Gen. 10.22); Γαιβάλ (< **ǵaybal*) 'Ebal' (Deut. 11.29).⁷¹ A few centuries later, on the other hand, in transcriptions of those such as Aquila, there is more evidence for contraction: e.g., Κηνάν (< **qaynan*) 'Kenan' (Gen. 5.9).⁷² Generally, Greek and Latin transcriptions of Hebrew from the first few centuries CE in Palestine (e.g., Origen and Jerome) tend to exhibit more consistent contraction than does the LXX. While it is unlikely that all dialects and/or traditions of Hebrew contracted unstressed diphthongs at the same time, the evidence from the transcriptions nevertheless suggests that we might posit the end of the Second Temple Period as a tentative *terminus ante quem* for the **ʔay(y)* > *ʔē* shift.

The suggested tentative absolute chronology may be summarized as follows:

<i>Chronology</i>	<i>ʔē</i> ‘where?’		<i>ʔayyē</i> ‘where?’			
Early Proto-Semitic		<i>*ʔayy-ʋ</i>		Ø		
			<i>*ʔayy-ʋ</i> augmented with suffix <i>*-ay</i> to create new form:	<i>*ʔayy-ay</i>		
PNWS	loss of final short vowels:	<i>*ʔayy-</i>	collapse of final diphthong <i>*-ay</i> > <i>-ē</i> in <i>*ʔayy-ay</i> due to proclisis:	<i>ʔayyē</i>		
Early Hebrew						
	simplification of final gemination and collapse of diphthong:	<i>ʔē</i>				
Second Temple Period Transcriptions						

Possible Objections

There are a couple of potential objections which may be leveled against what has been proposed with respect to *ʔē* and *ʔayyē*. First, if the ending of *ʔayyē* comes from the adverbial ending **-ay*, it ought to be represented orthographically by a *yod* (y) rather than a *heh* (h).⁷³ While words like *māṭay* and *ʔāzay* seem to support this claim, the

imperatives of the III-weak verbs such as *šatē* (< **svtay*) demonstrate that a long *-ē* from a contracted final **-ay* may be written with a *heh* (*h*) as a *mater lectionis*.⁷⁴

Second, how do phrases such as *ʔē ze* and *ʔē mizze* fit into the picture? While the syntax of *ʔē ze* is essentially the same as *ʔē* and *ʔayyē* in that it precedes noun phrases,⁷⁵ the syntax of *ʔē mizze* ‘whence?’ is more parallel to that of *mēʔayin* and *ʔēpō* in that it can precede either noun phrases or verb phrases.⁷⁶

While a full analysis of such forms lies beyond the scope of this paper, we may offer a suggestion. Huehnergard and Pat-El have shown that interrogatives such as *mā* and *lāmmā* followed by the demonstrative *ze* are actually a remnant of an old Semitic clefting pattern, and that in these instances *ze* is in fact the old relative pronoun.⁷⁷ Accordingly, we ought to read phrases like *ū-maz-ze tō(?)mārū ʔēlay* as ‘what (is it) that you say to me?’ and phrases like *lāmmāz-ze šāḥāqā šārā* as ‘why (is it) that Sarah laughed?’.⁷⁸

While they did not specifically address the combination *ʔē ze*, it may be possible to apply the same principles to our discussion. Accordingly, if we take *ze* as the relative pronoun of a cleft sentence, we could read a phrase like *ʔē ze šāḥar rūaḥ YHWH mē-ʔittî l^e-dabbēr ʔôtāk* as, ‘where (is it) that the spirit of YHWH passed from me to speak to

you?'.⁷⁹ However, because the other occurrences of *ʔē ze* 'where?' all precede a single noun phrase, it is possible that, while originally *ʔē ze* created a cleft interrogative, it eventually became lexicalized.⁸⁰

However, the situation is not as simple when we come to the phrase *ʔē mizze*, the meaning of which is 'whence?'.⁸¹ We can demonstrate that *ʔē mizze* means 'whence?' because it is often interchangeable with the more common interrogative *mēʔayin* 'whence?'. The fact that these interrogatives have the same meaning can be seen in parallel phrases such as *ʔē mizze tāḇō(?)* and *mēʔayin tāḇō(?)* 'whence do you come?' as well as *ʔē mizze hēmmā* and *mēʔayin hēmmā* 'whence are they?'.⁸²

It is problematic, however, to understand *ze* as a relative pronoun in the phrase *ʔē mizze* for a number of reasons. For one, the archaic relative pronoun *ze/zū/zō* is nowhere else the object of a preposition.⁸³ Therefore, it would be unusual to find it used that way only in this expression. Secondly, though the meaning 'whence' may be achieved in BH by means of a relative pronoun (e.g., the Standard Biblical Hebrew [SBH] relative pronoun *ʔāšer*), the relative pronoun must be accompanied by some sort of resumptive element *within the relative clause*.⁸⁴ For example, in the phrase, *hā-ʔādāmā ʔāšer luqqah miš-šām* 'the land whence he was taken', the adverbial phrase *miš-šām*

functions as the resumptive element.⁸⁵ Therefore, the preposition *min* must be within the relative clause in order to create the meaning ‘whence’ or ‘from which’. This may be seen in the example *haḥereḇ ʔāšer ʔattem yārēʔim mimmennā* ‘the sword *from which* you fear’ in which the relative pronoun (*ʔāšer*) *along with* the resumptive pronominal suffix on the preposition (*mimmennā*) achieves the meaning ‘from which’.⁸⁶

The construction *mēʔāšer* (*prep. ‘from’ + SBH relative pronoun*), on the contrary, never means ‘whence’ in BH.⁸⁷ Rather, a relative pronoun which is the object of a preposition is always an “independent relative” without an antecedent.⁸⁸ For example, if the above example were to read *haḥereḇ mēʔāšer ʔattem yārēʔim*, it would not mean, ‘the sword *from which* you fear’, but rather, ‘the sword from *the one whom* you fear’. In short, while in a language like Greek a relative pronoun may be the object of a preposition *and also* have an antecedent elsewhere in the sentence as in τὴν γῆν ἐξ ἧς ἐλήμφθη ‘the land from which he was taken’, SBH may not do the same.⁸⁹

Therefore, we must seek a different explanation for the phrase *ʔē mizze*. It may be that while *ʔē ze* was originally a cleft construction, at some point *ze* was no longer interpreted as a relative pronoun.⁹⁰ Rather, just as the demonstrative *ze* can refer to a person that is near, namely ‘this (one)’, it can also refer to an area that is near, namely

‘this (place)’.⁹¹ This can be seen in phrases such as *lēk mizze* ‘go away from *this place/here!*’ and *šēb bā-ze* ‘sit in *this place/here!*’.⁹² This meaning of the demonstrative is clearly illustrated in the phrase *mī hēbī?ākā hālōm ū-mā ?attā ſōše bā-ze ū-mal-lākā pō* ‘who brought you hither and what are you doing in *this place/here* and what business do you have here?’.⁹³

It is possible, then, that at some point *?ē ze* was re-analyzed as *?ē* + ‘this place/here’ (*ze*) on analogy to the word *?ēpō*. If such a meta-analysis did occur, it may be preferable to explain the word *ze* in the expression *?ē mizze* as the regular demonstrative (i.e., ‘this [place]/here’)⁹⁴ rather than a relative pronoun (even though the archaic relative pronoun is the likely etymology of *ze* in the phrase *?ē ze*).

The Relationship Between *?ayy- ‘Where?’ and *?ayy- ‘Which?’

One final issue that ought to be addressed is the relationship between the interrogative particle *?ayy- ‘where?’ under discussion and the interrogative adjective *?ayy- ‘which?’ also common in Semitic.⁹⁵ The interrogative adjective is found quite clearly in Akkadian (*ayyum*), Ethiopic (*?ayy*), and Arabic (*?ayyun*);⁹⁶ vestiges of the interrogative adjective may also be found in other Semitic languages such as Old South Arabian (*?y*

‘who[ever]/whatsoever’), Ugaritic (*ʔayyu* ‘whichever’), and Targumic Aramaic (*ʔydy* ‘which one?’).⁹⁷

With respect to Akkadian, the interrogative adjective *ayyum* is marked for case, number, and gender (*ayyum/ayyim/ayyam, ayyītum..., ayyūtum..., ayyātum...*). The case, number, and gender of *ayyum* correspond with that of the noun it modifies; thus, *ana ayyim ʃuḥārim ām tapqid* ‘to which servant did you supply grain?’ and *narkabti ʃarrim ayyītam irakkab* ‘which royal chariot will he ride?’.⁹⁸ In Ethiopic, which only marks the accusative case (-a), the interrogative adjective is marked for case and number (sgl. *ʔayy/ʔayya*, pl. *ʔayyāt/ʔayyāta*). Like Akkadian, the case of the interrogative adjective agrees with that of the noun it modifies; thus, *ʔayy hagar zāti* ‘which city is this?’ but *ʔayya hagara ḥanaʃu* ‘which city did they build?’.⁹⁹ The interrogative adjective in Arabic, like Akkadian, may be marked for case, number, and gender (*ʔayyun/ʔayyin/ʔayyan, ʔayyatun..., ʔayyūna..., ʔayyātun...*). However, unlike Akkadian and Ethiopic, the interrogative adjective is followed by a noun in the genitive. In other words, while the case of *ʔayyun* is determined by its syntactic function in the sentence, it is always in construct with the noun that follows; thus, *ʔayyu kitābin* ‘which book?’

and *min ʔayyi qabīlatin ʔanta* ‘from which tribe are you?’.¹⁰⁰ This construction may be regarded as a kind of *iḏāfa ghayr ḥaqīqīya* (improper annexation).¹⁰¹

In light of the evidence in both East and West Semitic, it seems likely that the interrogative adjective inflected for case, gender, and number in Proto-Semitic. Accordingly, the interrogative adjective is analyzable as being made up of two parts: the interrogative base *ʔayy- and adjectival morphological endings. What, then, was the original meaning of the interrogative base *ʔayy-? The earliest attestation is found in Old Akkadian in the proper name *ʔAyyabum* ‘where is the father?’.¹⁰² As discussed earlier, this meaning for the base *ʔayy- is found throughout Semitic. Even though it is quite common in Semitic for the base *ʔayy- to be combined with various morphemes and still carry the meaning of ‘where?’ (Akk. *ayyānum*, Arab. *ʔayna*, Aram. *ʔy mnn*, Geʿez *ʔayte*, Heb. *ʔayyē*), there is not enough evidence to reconstruct any particular one of these augmented forms of *ʔayy- to Proto-Semitic.¹⁰³ In fact, the sheer diversity of these affixed morphemes seems to indicate that it is the base (*ʔayy-)—and not the suffixes—that carries the semantics of the interrogative of place.¹⁰⁴ Moreover, in addition to these suffixed forms, both East and West Semitic attest to the unaugmented form of *ʔayy- that means ‘where?’ (Ugaritic *ʔi*, Hebrew *ʔē*, Standard Babylonian *ē*, and

Old Akkadian PNs such as *ʔAyyabum*). Accordingly, we may reconstruct **ʔayy-v* ‘where?’ as an independent lexeme to Proto-Semitic. This would mean that the forms that do have the suffixes are mere examples of affix pleonasm at an early stage in Semitic as argued earlier.

If this reconstruction is correct, it means that the interrogative adverb ‘where?’ in Proto-Semitic is unanalyzable. In other words, it is its own separate lexeme. On the other hand, our reconstruction for the interrogative adjective ‘which?’ in Proto-Semitic is analyzable: the interrogative base **ʔayy-* and the addition of adjectival morphological inflection. This means that the interrogative adjective is the more complex form in Proto-Semitic. Therefore, it is possible that the interrogative adjective ‘which?’ was derived from the interrogative adverb ‘where?’ It is not hard to imagine how the interrogative in a question like ‘where is the king's house?’ could develop to become ‘which is the king's house?’. In fact, this semantic development seems to happen with the word *ʔē ze* from BH to Mishnaic Hebrew.¹⁰⁵

Moreover, such a scenario has support cross-linguistically. According to Cysouw, the interrogative of place (‘where?’) is its own separate lexeme in almost all languages. Further, he argues that when the interrogative of selection (‘which?’) is derived from

another interrogative, its primary source is the interrogative of place.¹⁰⁶ In sum, while deriving the Semitic interrogative of selection (*ʔayy-) from the interrogative of place is somewhat speculative, it seems a more likely scenario than the reverse.

Conclusions

In conclusion, I have argued that the interrogative particle *ʔayy-*v* in Semitic is realized in BH as ʔē rather than *ʔay because the diphthong reduced as a consequence of the word being proclitic (*ay > -ē / _[-str]). This sound change, however, happened later than did the original collapse of the diphthong *ay in words like the construct *bēt-* (< *bayt-). Second, I argued that the form *ʔayy-ay may be reconstructed for BH ʔayyē. It was also due to proclisis that the diphthong reduced in the case of *ʔayy-ay. This change, on the other hand, *did* happen at the same time as words like *bēt-* and *sūsē-*. Finally, I argued that the ending *-ay on this interrogative is the same adverbial ending which we find numerously in Akkadian in words like *mati* and *timāli* and as vestiges throughout the rest of the Semitic languages. This, I claimed, is an example of what is known as “affix pleonasm” or “over-characterization.” I hope these findings will be able to contribute something more not only to our diachronic understanding of Hebrew, but also to the behavior of interrogatives in Semitic in general.

* I would like to thank John Huehnergard and Na'ama Pat-El for their helpful comments on earlier versions of this paper. Any remaining errors are mine alone.

¹ Joüon and Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Rome, 2009), 102k, n4.

² Josef Tropper, 'Die hebräische Partikel *hinnē*^h 'siehe!' Morphologische und syntaktische Probleme', *KUSATU* 3.81–121 (2002): 107–13, 117–19.

³ Stefan Schorch, '„Siehe, wohl dem Mann ...“ Die hebräischen Interjektionen אֲשֶׁר־ und הִנֵּה und die Partikel -y', in Bogdan Burtea, Josef Tropper, and Helen Younansardaroud (eds), *Studia Semitic et Semitoamitica: Festschrift für Rainer Voigt anlässlich seines 60* (Münster, 2005), 379–84.

⁴ Ambjörn Sjörs, 'The History of Standard Negation in Semitic', Ph.D. dissertation (Uppsala University 2015), 173–78.

⁵ Sjörs suggests that the Ugaritic forms *?i* and *?iy* may be vocalized as *?ê* (< **?ayy-ū*) and *?eyyê* (< **?ayy-ay*), respectively, paralleling the Hebrew forms *?ē* and *?ayyē* ('Negation', 177). This may suggest that the forms are inherited in both Hebrew and Ugaritic. For more on this, see also the discussion regarding 'Early Lexical Variants in Semitic' below.

⁶ *CAD*, 1/1:220.

⁷ *CAD*, 1/1:227.

-
- ⁸ Anson Rainey, *Canaanite in the Amarna Tablets*, vol. 3 (Leiden, 1996), 109–11.
- ⁹ Wolf Leslau, *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez* (Wiesbaden, 1987), 51.
- ¹⁰ William Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language* (India, 2004), i, 285.
- ¹¹ Marcus Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi and the Midrashic Literature* (London; New York, 1903) 44, 47.
- ¹² John Huehnergard, *An Introduction to Ugaritic* (Peabody, Massachusetts, 2012), 77, 142, and Daniel Sivan, *A Grammar of the Ugaritic Language* (Leiden, 2001), 182.
- ¹³ In Ugaritic, /a/ was raised to /i/ (pronounced as [e]) before /y/ ($a > i / _y$); thus, $*\text{ʔayyv} > \text{ʔiyv}$ (pronounced [ʔeyyv]). This is demonstrated by the syllabic transcription of *hym* ‘life’, which is *hé-yu-ma*; thus, *hiyyūma* (pronounced [heyūma]) from $*\text{ḥayyūma}$ (Huehnergard, *Introduction to Ugaritic*, 29 and John Huehnergard, *Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription* [HSS 32; Winona Lake, 2008], 275).
- ¹⁴ That Hebrew and Ugaritic must have developed this form (ʔē) separately can be proven by the fact that final gemination was still preserved early in Hebrew. This may be shown by the following rule: in Hebrew, the lowering/backing (“lengthening”) of short *a* occurred in singly-closed stressed syllables ($a > \bar{a} / _ [+str]C\#$), in open stressed syllables ($a > \bar{a} / _ [+str]Cv$), and pretonically ($a > \bar{a} / _ Cv [+str]$). This sound change is certainly internal to Hebrew.

Therefore, the fact that this “lengthening” applies to words like *ʔāb* (< *ʔab) ‘father’ but not to *ʔaḇ* (< *ʔapp) ‘nose’ shows that final gemination had not yet simplified at this stage of Hebrew. Accordingly, the final gemination in *ʔayy- would still have been preserved early in Hebrew, which would mean that Ugaritic *ʔē* must be a separate/parallel development. For the lowering/backing of short vowels, see Thomas O. Lambdin and John Huehnergard, *The Historical Grammar of Classical Hebrew: An Outline* (Cambridge, Mass., 2000), 11.

¹⁵ In multiple Semitic languages, the base *ʔayy- > ʔay- when a consonantal suffix is added to the base (e.g., Geʿez *ʔayte*, Arab. *ʔayna*, Aram. *ʔaykā*). For a similar phonological change internal to Arabic, see Wright, *Grammar*, i. 76c. He cites *ʔayma* (< *ʔayyu + *mā*) ‘what?’ and the well-known development of the colloquial *ʔayš* ‘what?’ (< *ʔayyu *šayʔin* [lit: ‘which thing?’]) as examples.

¹⁶ An exception to this is found in verbal forms like *nīḇnētā* ‘you were built’, in which *ay > ē under the stress. This, however, is likely due to paradigm pressure.

¹⁷ Lambdin and Huehnergard, *Historical Grammar*, 10, 77, 81.

¹⁸ Lambdin and Huehnergard, *Historical Grammar*, 8, 10, 12. Final short vowels were lost (-*ṽ* > Ø / _#) very early in Hebrew as in **baytu* > **bayt* ‘house’. At a later stage, unstressed

diphthongs reduced (**aw* > *ō*; **ay* > *ē* / _[-str]) as in **mawtī* > **mōtī* ‘my death’. Subsequent to this, final gemination was simplified (*C₂C₂* > *C₂* / _{- #}) as in **ḥuqq* > **ḥuq* ‘law’.

¹⁹ For the Pre-Masoretic Hebrew 3mp possessive suffix on a plural noun as **-himm*, see Lambdin and Huehnergard, *Historical Grammar*, 51.

²⁰ It should be noted that while the construct form of *ḥay* is indeed *ḥē*, the form *ḥē* is also found in contexts in which it is not construct (e.g., in oath formulas). It is likely that this form was prone to grammaticalization because it was proclitic. For more on the grammaticalization of *ḥē* in oath formulas, see Wilhelm Gesenius, E Kautzsch, and A. E. Cowley, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* (Mineola, N.Y., 2006), 93aa n1. For the relationship between grammaticalization and proclisis in Semitic, see John Huehnergard, ‘On the Etymology of the Hebrew Relative *šē*’ Steven E. Fassberg and Avi Hurvitz (eds), *Biblical Hebrew in its Northwest Semitic Setting* (Jerusalem, 2006), 119–22.

²¹ Note a similar comparison in Sjörs, ‘Negation’, 174–75.

²² Lambdin and Huehnergard, *Historical Grammar*, 12.

²³ The word *gay*(?) ‘valley’ is of interest here. Though it is most often represented orthographically as גַּי (*gy?*), there are a significant number of instances in which it is written גַּי (*gy*); this orthography is even found in early texts such as Deuteronomy (34.6) and Joshua.

Accordingly, the change **gay?* > *gay*, at least as a variant form, must have occurred relatively early. The forms without *aleph* show the same pattern as *ḥay/ḥē* (cstr.) and *day/dē* (cstr.) in the Masoretic Text, namely *gay/gē* (cstr.). However, the reduction of the diphthong in **gay* (cstr.) > *gē* would have already occurred prior to **ḥay* (cstr.) > *ḥē* and **day* (cstr.) > *dē*. This is because the final gemination in **ḥayy* and **dayy* would have prevented the contraction of the diphthong **ay* at the time of (**gay?* >) **gay* (cstr.) > *gē*.

²⁴ That is, without some sort of dependent like *ʔē (miz)ze* or *ʔēpō*.

²⁵ Gen. 4.9, Deut. 32.37, 1 Sam. 26.16, and Prov. 31.4 (*ketiv*: *ʔō qere*: *ʔē*).

²⁶ For a few exceptions (out of 17 occurrences of *ʔē ze*) to this see 1 Kgs. 2.24, Ecc. 2.3, and Ecc. 11.6. However, 1 Kgs. 2.24 may be a shortened version of a formulaic phrase (i.e. *ʔē ze hadderek* + motion verb) which originally would have had *ʔē ze* precede a noun phrase. For this same phrase elsewhere see also 2 Kgs. 3.8; Job 38.19, 24; 2 Chr. 18.23 (the parallel passage to 1 Kgs. 2.24) apud Waltke and O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN., 1990), 18.4b n26. The phrase *ʔē ze* in Ecc. 2.3 and Ecc. 11.6, on the other hand, seems to have a different meaning entirely, more in line with Mishnaic Hebrew, as described in Joüon and Muraoka, *Grammar*, 143g n4.

²⁷ Lambdin and Huehnergard, *Historical Grammar*, 7, 10–11, 76–77.

²⁸ Daniel Sivan does in fact argue that *ʔayyĩ is the form we ought to reconstruct for Ugaritic ʔiy (ʔiyyĩ, according to Sivan). According to Sivan, this is due to vowel assimilation to a strong thematic vowel. *Grammar*, 44. However, Huehnergard shows that the *i* vowel in Ugaritic ʔiy does in fact come from a historical *a* vowel, but is raised to *i* because it precedes a *y*.

Introduction to Ugaritic, 29.

²⁹ Lambdin and Huehnergard, *Historical Grammar*, 8.

³⁰ This is, in fact, the reconstruction suggested by Sjörs mentioned earlier (‘Negation’, 174, 176).

³¹ Lambdin and Huehnergard, *Historical Grammar*, 10-11.

³² Lambdin and Huehnergard regard the III-weak imperatives, which end in a *šere*, as “semi-” or “virtually” proclitic. *Historical Grammar*, 12, 63.

³³ Waltke and O'Connor, *Syntax*, 18.4.

³⁴ Judg. 9.38, Psa. 115.2, Job 17.15, Zech. 1.5.

³⁵ Zech. 1.5.

³⁶ Job 15.23. The implied noun phrase is *leḥem* ‘bread’.

³⁷ Gen. 3.9; Ex. 2.20; 2 Kgs. 19.13; Isa. 19.12; Jer. 37.19 (*ketiv*); Mic. 7.10; Nah. 3.17; Job 14.10, 20.7.

-
- ³⁸ Wolfram von Soden, *Grundriss der Akkadischen Grammatik* (Rome, 1995), 203 and John Huehnergard, *A Grammar of Akkadian: Third Edition* (Winona Lake, Indiana, 2011), 313.
- ³⁹ Von Soden, *Grundriss*, 35.
- ⁴⁰ Wolfram von Soden, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch* (Wiesbaden, 1965), 632. See also von Soden *Grundriss*, 203.
- ⁴¹ *CAD*, 2:249.
- ⁴² *CAD*, 17/1:268.
- ⁴³ Von Soden, *Grundriss*, 203. For the *-ay > ī change in Babylonian, and *-ay > ē change in Assyrian, see Huehnergard, *Grammar of Akkadian*, 600.
- ⁴⁴ For *mty* in Qatabanic see A.F.L. Beeston, *Sabaic Grammar* (Manchester:, 1984), 67.
- ⁴⁵ Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 51–52.
- ⁴⁶ Curiously, the diphthong in *māṭay* did not collapse to ē in BH as it did in *ʔayyē*. The simple explanation for this is that the word *māṭay* is not proclitic. However, the reason why *ʔayyē*, and not *māṭay*, would be proclitic is more difficult to explain. It may be related to the fact that *māṭay* is frequently part of an expression in which it is preceded by a preposition (*ʕad māṭay* ‘until when/how long?’). However it may be accounted for, it is the lack of proclisis which explains the fact that the diphthong in *māṭay* did not collapse to ē.

⁴⁷ Pat-El regards Arabic *kay* and Akkadian *kī* as being related in Na‘ama Pat-El, ‘Historical Syntax of Aramaic: A Note on Subordination’ in Gzella and Folmer (eds), *Aramaic in its Historical and Linguistic Setting* (Wiesbaden, 2008), 59.

⁴⁸ Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 61.

⁴⁹ Ps. 124.3, 4, 5. *BDB* suggests comparing these verses, in which the apodosis of an unrealistic condition is introduced, to the same sort of formula in Ps. 119.92. It seems there is no distinction in function between *ʔāz* and *ʔāzay*.

⁵⁰ Von Soden, *Grundriss*, 203.

⁵¹ Sjörs, ‘Negation’, 175–78.

⁵² Even the (fourth) *qere* use of *ʔē šēkār* in Pro. 31.4 may be compared with *ʔayyē dāgān wā-yāyin* in Lam. 2.12.

⁵³ Deut. 32.37 and Joel 2.17.

⁵⁴ Gen. 4.9 and Gen. 18.9.

⁵⁵ 1 Sam. 26.16 and Isa. 51.13.

⁵⁶ Michael A. Covington, *Evidence for Lexicalism: a critical review* (Bloomington, 1981), 33, apud Francesco Gardani, ‘Affix pleonasm’ in Peter O. Müller, Ingeborg Ohnheiser, Susan Olsen

and Franz Rainer (eds), *Word-formation. An international handbook of the languages of Europe*, vol. 1, (Berlin; Boston, 2015), 542.

⁵⁷ Geert Booij, *The Grammar of Words* (Oxford, 2007), 273 apud Gardani, ‘Affix pleonasm’, 538.

⁵⁸ Gardani, ‘Affix pleonasm’, 538–39.

⁵⁹ Waltke and O'Connor, *Syntax*, 18.4.

⁶⁰ Solomon L. Skoss, *The Hebrew-Arabic Dictionary of the Bible Known as Kitāb Jāmiʿ al-Alfāz (Agrōn) of David ben Abraham al-Fāsi*, vol. 1 (New Haven, 1936), 73–75.

⁶¹ Sjörs, ‘Negation’, 173–78.

⁶² CAD, 1/1:220, 226–27.

⁶³ Rainey, *Canaanite*, 109–11.

⁶⁴ Stefan Weninger, *The Semitic Languages: An International Handbook* (Berlin/Boston, 2011), 170. For the loss of gemination when suffixes are attached to this particle see Wright, *Grammar*, i, 276.

⁶⁵ Waltke and O'Connor, *Syntax*, 18.4. See also Sjörs, ‘Negation’, 174–75.

⁶⁶ Gardani, ‘Affix pleonasm’, 538, 542.

⁶⁷ Christian Lehmann, 'Pleonasm and hypercharacterisation' in Geert E. Booij and Jaap v.

Marle (eds), *Yearbook of morphology 2005* (Dordrecht, 2005), 137–38 apud Gardani, 'Affix pleonasm', 540.

⁶⁸ For more on the typology of interrogatives, see Michael Cysouw, 'Interrogative Words: An Exercise in Lexical Typology', paper presented at the session on question formation in Bantu at Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft (Berlin, 13 February 2004).

⁶⁹ Benjamin Kantor, 'The Second Column (Secunda) of Origen's Hexapla in Light of Greek Pronunciation', Ph.D. dissertation (University of Texas 2017), 239.

⁷⁰ Kantor, 'Secunda', 245–46, 252.

⁷¹ Frederick W. Knobloch, 'Hebrew Sounds in Greek Script: Transcriptions and Related Phenomena in the Septuagint, with Special Focus on Genesis', Ph.D. dissertation (University of Pennsylvania 1995), 408–10.

⁷² Joseph Reider, *An Index to Aquila: Greek-Hebrew, Hebrew-Greek, Latin-Hebrew, with the Syriac and Armenian Evidence* (Leiden, 1966), 322.

⁷³ Schorch acknowledges as much regarding *hinnē* ('Siehe', 382).

⁷⁴ Lambdin and Huehnergard, *Historical Grammar*, 63.

⁷⁵ For the two exceptions to this see 1 Kgs. 2.24 and Ecc. 11.6. However, 1 Kgs. 2.24 may simply be a shortened version of a formulaic phrase (i.e. *ʔē ze hadderek* + motion verb) which originally would have had *ʔē ze* precede a noun phrase. For this same phrase elsewhere see also 2 Kgs. 3.8; Job 38.19, 24; 2 Chr. 18.23 (the parallel passage to 1 Kgs. 2.24) apud Waltke and O'Connor, *Syntax*, 18.4b n26. The phrase *ʔē ze* in Ecc. 11.6 (as well as Ecc. 2.3), on the other hand, seems to have a different meaning entirely, more closely in line with that of Mishnaic Hebrew, as described in Joüon and Muraoka, *Grammar*, 143g n4.

⁷⁶ Waltke and O'Connor assert that while *ʔēpō* may be used before verbal clauses, the word *ʔayyē* may not be (*Syntax*, 18.4c).

⁷⁷ John Huehnergard and Na'ama Pat-El, 'Some aspects of the cleft in Semitic languages', in Tali Bar and Eran Cohen (eds), *Studies in Semitic and General Linguistics in Honor of Gideon Goldenberg* (Münster, 2007), 332.

⁷⁸ Judg. 18.24 and Gen. 18.13 in Huehnergard and Pat-El, 'Some aspects of the cleft', 332.

⁷⁹ 1 Kgs. 24.22. This is perhaps the only case in which *ʔē ze* 'where?' precedes a verbal phrase rather than a noun phrase. However, I argued earlier (note 26) that this sentence may be a shortened version of a common formula (*ʔē ze hadderek* + motion verb), in which *ʔē ze* would be followed by a single noun phrase.

⁸⁰ A sentence must follow the relative pronoun for the sentence to be considered a cleft sentence. In Hebrew, a single noun phrase does not make a sentence. Therefore, the other occurrences of *ʔē ze* ‘where?’ may not be regarded as cleft sentences.

⁸¹ Waltke and O'Connor, *Syntax*, 18.4b.

⁸² 2 Sam. 1.3.; Judg. 17.9; 1 Sam. 25.11; Josh. 2.4.

⁸³ Waltke and O'Connor, *Syntax*, 19.5. There is, of course, nothing wrong with a relative pronoun being the object of a preposition, but the fact that this would be the only context in which it happens in Hebrew is noteworthy.

⁸⁴ Waltke and O'Connor, *Syntax*, 19.3b.

⁸⁵ Gen. 3.23.

⁸⁶ Jer. 42.16.

⁸⁷ *mēʔāšer* would be the SBH syntactic equivalent of *mizze*, if *ze* is functioning as a relative pronoun.

⁸⁸ Waltke and O'Connor, *Syntax*, 19.3c.

⁸⁹ Gen. 3.23 (LXX).

⁹⁰ Compare also the expression *ʔē lā-zō(?)t* in Jer. 5.7 ‘on what basis/why?’ in Waltke and O'Connor, *Syntax*, 18.4b. Expressions like this and the fact that *zō(?)t* is never used as a relative

would seem to indicate that also in the construction *?ē + prep. + ze* the word *ze* is not being interpreted synchronically as a relative. Accordingly, in the context one might read *?ē lā-zō(?)t ?eslōah lāk* as ‘how, for this/on account of this, will I forgive you?’. The use of the f.s. *zō(?)t* ‘this’ instead of *ze* in this context also supports the proposal that such expressions are not making use of a relative.

⁹¹ Joüon and Muraoka, *Grammar*, 143a.

⁹² 1 Kgs. 17.3 and 2 Sam. 11.12.

⁹³ Jdgs. 18.3.

⁹⁴ See BDB, ‘*ze*’, 6a,e.

⁹⁵ John Huehnergard, ‘Afro-Asiatic’ in R. D. Woodard (ed), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages* (Cambridge, 2004), 151.

⁹⁶ For Akkadian see Huehnergard, *Grammar of Akkadian*, 122–23 and *CAD*, 1/1:234. For Arabic see Wright, *Grammar*, i. 270c, 275d; ii. 220a, 315b. For Ethiopic see Leslau, *Dictionary*, 49 and Thomas O. Lambdin, *Introduction to Classical Ethiopic (Ge'ez)* (Atlanta, 1978), 36.

⁹⁷ For OSA, see Norbert Nebes and Peter Stein, ‘Ancient South Arabian’ in R. D. Woodard (ed), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the World's Ancient Languages* (Cambridge, 2004), 471, and Leslau, *Dictionary*, 49. For Ugaritic, see Huehnergard, *Introduction to Ugaritic*, 36, 142. For

Targumic Aramaic, see Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 45. For a list of possible Semitic cognates see Leslau, *Dictionary*, 49. One could also include Mishnaic Hebrew *ʔē ze* ‘which?’ in this list, but it seems more likely to me that it is a later development from *ʔē* ‘where?’ + *ze* than a vestige of the Semitic interrogative adjective. For more, see note 85 and the discussion below.

⁹⁸ Huehnergard, *Grammar of Akkadian*, 122.

⁹⁹ Lambdin, *Classical Ethiopic (Geʿez)* (Atlanta, 1978), 36.

¹⁰⁰ Wright, *Grammar*, i. 270c, 275d; ii. 220a, 315b.

¹⁰¹ Wright, *Grammar*, ii. 198c.

¹⁰² *CAD*, 1/1:220.

¹⁰³ A potential exception could be found by connecting Akk. *ayyānum/ayyāna* with Arab. *ʔayyāna*. However, *ʔayyāna* means ‘when?’ and not ‘where?’ in Arabic. For *ʔayyāna* in Arabic, see Wright, *Grammar*, i. 285d.

¹⁰⁴ cf. Sjörs, who argues that it is the locative suffixes *-*ū* or *-*ay* (at least in Ugaritic and Hebrew) that provide the meaning of ‘where?’ when attached to the interrogative base **ʔay(y)-* and not the base itself (‘Negation’, 174–75).

¹⁰⁵ Joüon and Muraoka, *Grammar*, 143g n4. For examples in BH see Qoheleth 2.3; 11.6. For examples in Mishnaic Hebrew, see Pesah. 9.9 *w^e-ʔim ʔên yādūaʕ ʔē ze mēhen nišḥaṭ ri(ʔ)šôn* ‘and

if it is not known which of them was slaughtered first' and Hul. 8.1 *b^e-ʔê ze šulḥān* 'on which table?'. For the diachronic development, see Moses Hirsch Segal, *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* (Oxford, 1927), 44–45.

¹⁰⁶ Cysouw, 'Interrogative Words', 13–14.